Remarks

Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, and 16. No new matter has been added to the application by virtue of the present amendment.

Therefore, claims 1-6, 8-10, 16, 17, and 19-23 are pending in the subject application by virtue of the present amendment. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 1, 8, and 16 more clearly define Applicants' application and distinguish it over the prior art of record. It is respectfully requested that the subject application be reconsidered and passed to issuance in view of this amendment and response.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-10, 16-17, and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner indicates that, as to claim 1 (line 17), claim 8 (line 19), and claim 16 (line 21) it is not clearly indicated whether "the one or more temporal related tasks" refers to "the one or more tasks'; claim 1 (lines 16-17), claim 8 (lines 19-20), and claim 16 (lines 22-23), it is not clearly indicated whether "one or more temporal related tasks" refers to "one or more atomic sub-task" and how "one or more temporal related tasks" relates to "one or more atomic sub-task".

The Examiner indicates that, as to claim 16 (line 22), it is not clearly indicated whether "a central task queue" refers to "a central task queue in line 10.

The Examiner indicates that claims 2-6, 9-10, 17, 19-23 do not cure the deficiency of claims 1, 8 and 16 above, and therefore; they are rejected for the same reason above.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, and 16 to overcome the examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The language has been amended to clearly indicate which tasks are

being referred to in the claims with proper antecedent basis. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner indicates that claims 1-6, 8-10, 16-17, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Kato (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0051971 A1) in view of Magee et al. (U.S. Patent 5,729,710) and further in view of Matsui et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0010732A1). The Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Magee et al., and further in view of Matsui et al. and further in view of Martin (U.S. Patent 4,466,064).

Rejection of claims 1-6, 8-10, 16-17, and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully submit that Kato, individually or in combination with Magee, and/or Matsui, do not teach or suggest Applicants' independent claim 1 as amended, or any claims dependent thereupon.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method of task management using memory ranges of shared memory, and recites:

. . .

"generating one or more temporal related tasks from the one or more executed tasks, and prioritizing and connecting the one or more temporal related tasks by their temporal relationship and inserting the temporal related tasks into a central task queue to be executed according to their temporal relationship by one or more of the plurality of processors,"

. . .

Kato, Magee, or Matsui do not explicitly disclose or suggest the element of: "generating one or more temporal related tasks from the one or more executed tasks, and prioritizing and connecting the one or more temporal related tasks by their temporal relationship and inserting the temporal related tasks into a central task queue to be executed according to their temporal relationship by one or more of the plurality of processors." The Examiner concedes that Kato and Magee do not teach this element. (Office Action 4/29/2009, p.6, ¶ 10). The Examiner submits that Matsui does teach

this element, citing ¶¶ 136, 142, and 150.

While Matsui describes generating and allocating parallel processes in ¶ 136; nowhere does Matsui describe using the temporal relationship of tasks to group and execute those tasks. The use of temporal relationships to prioritize and execute tasks is an element unique to the present application. The use of "dummy processes" described by Matsui in ¶¶ 136 and 142 in no way relate to temporal relationships of tasks. The dummy processes merely provide fill the processors and put them in a waiting state and has nothing to do with grouping tasks.

The examiner cites ¶ 150 in Matsui, describes assigning identifiers to processes to maintain execution order of processes. Again, this does not describe grouping tasks by temporal relationship. It is the method of grouping tasks claimed in the pertinent element which is unique to the present application. The mere fact that Matsui describes grouping processes does not disclose or teach the method of grouping by temporal relationship.

As such the element of: "generating one or more temporal related tasks from the one or more executed tasks, and prioritizing and connecting the one or more temporal related tasks by their temporal relationship and inserting the temporal related tasks into a central task queue to be executed according to their temporal relationship by one or more of the plurality of processors," is not taught in any cited prior art.

Accordingly, claim 1 as amended, is submitted to be patentably distinguished over Kato in view of Magee and further in view of Matsui for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kato, individually or in combination with Magee, and/or Matsui, do not teach or suggest Applicants' independent claim 1, or any claims dependent thereupon.

Claim 8, which includes similar but not identical features to those of amended claim 1, is submitted to be patentably distinguished over Kato in view of Magee and further in view of Matsui for at least similar reasons to those set forth regarding claim 1.

Claim 16, which includes similar but not identical features to those of amended claim 1 and 8, is submitted to be patentably distinguished over Kato in view of Magee and further in view of Matsui for at least similar reasons to those set forth regarding claim 1 and 8 above.

Claims 2-6, 9-10, 17 and 19-22, which include all of the limitations of claim 1, 8 or 16 are submitted to be patentably distinguished over Kato in view of Magee and further in view of Firlie for at least similar reasons to those set forth regarding claim 1, 8, 16.

Rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has also rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Kato in view of Magee et al., and further in view of Matsui et al. and further in view of Martin (U.S. Patent 4,466,064).

Applicants respectfully submit that Kato, individually or in combination with Magee, Matsui, and/or Martin do not teach or suggest Applicants' claim 23.

Accordingly, claim 23 is submitted to be patentably distinguished over Kato in view of Magee et al., further in view of Matusi as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Martin for at least the same reasons as set forth above regarding claim 1

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and submit that the rejections to the claims have been overcome.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing remarks, all of the claims now presented are believed to be in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn and this application be passed to issue at an early date.

The Examiner is urged to call the undersigned at the number listed below if, in the Examiner's opinion, such a phone conference would aid in furthering the prosecution of this application. No fee is due by virtue of this response. However, if the PTO determines that a fee is required, please charge Applicants' Deposit Account, 09-0456.

Respectfully submitted,

For: Maximino et al.

By: /Ryan Simmons/

Ryan K. Simmons
Registration No. 45,848
Telephone No.: (802) 769-1809
Fax No.: (802) 769-8938
EMAIL: rksimmon@us.ibm.com

International Business Machines Corporation
Intellectual Property Law - Mail 972E
1000 River Road
Essex Junction, VT 05452